UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,513	02/15/2006	Yoshinobu Ishigaki	JP920030171US1	9590

30449   7590   02/04/2009
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE
SUITE 302
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER
AVERY, JEREMIAH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/568,513
Filing Date: February 15, 2006
Appellant(s): ISHIGAKI ET AL.

Jack P. Friedman, Reg. No. 44,688
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/31/08 appealing from the Office action

mailed on 8/19/08.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,453,353	Win et al.	9-2002
6,834,272	Naor et al.	12-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 23-25 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,453,353 to Win et al., hereinafter Win.

1.   Regarding claim 23, Win teaches a method for providing attribute data, said

method comprising:

receiving a request from a user device via a network for a virtual ID token relating to

attribute information pertaining to a subscriber associated with the user device (Figures

5A, 5C, column 2, lines 42-67);

responsive to the request for the virtual ID token, reading a data record from a

database, said data record comprising L attributes of the subscriber, L being at least 2

(Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64);

providing the data record to the user device via the network (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8,

column 5, lines 1-12, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-16 and column 26, lines 14-67,

"remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the

instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides

a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a

local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through

one or more networks to other data devices");

receiving, from the user device via the network, a selection of M attributes of the L

attributes, M being less than L (Figure 10b, column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer

can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a

telephone line via a modem", "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data
communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922"
and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more
networks to other data devices");

generating a virtual record including the M attributes selected from the data record, said
virtual record comprising a virtual ID (VID) for identifying the virtual record (Figures 10a-
10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52);

storing the generated virtual record in the database (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in
the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5,
lines 13-20, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52);

and providing the virtual ID token to the user device via the network, wherein the virtual
ID token comprises the VID (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 2, lines 42-67, column 5,
lines 1-12 and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into
its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem"
"Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a
network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920
typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data
devices"),

wherein an attribute information providing server performs said receiving the request for
the virtual ID token, said reading the data record from the database, said providing the
data record to the user device, said receiving the selection of M attributes, said
generating the virtual record, said storing the generated virtual record in the database,

and said providing the virtual ID token to the user device (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing,

in the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5,

lines 13-20, column 11, lines 42-64, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-

52).

2.   Regarding claim 24, Win teaches receiving a request comprising the VID for

attribute information associated with the VID from an attribute information receiving

apparatus via the network (Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15,

lines 35-52);

reading the virtual record from the database in response to the request comprising the

VID (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to

one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 11, lines 42-64, column 12,

lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52);

and after said reading, providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving

apparatus via the network (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 2, lines 42-67, column 5, lines

1-12 and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its

dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem"

"Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a

network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920

typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data

devices"),

wherein the attribute information providing server performs said receiving the request

comprising the VID, said reading the virtual record from the database, and said

providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving apparatus (column 2,

lines 42-67, column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each

resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 12, lines 32-55 and

column 15, lines 35-52).

3.   Regarding claim 25, Win teaches wherein said providing the virtual record to the

attribute information receiving apparatus is performed in manner that ensures that the

virtual ID is concealed from the attribute information receiving apparatus when the

virtual record is received by the attribute information receiving apparatus (Figures 3b,

3c, 4, 5a-5e and 6, column 6, lines 41-54, column 8, lines 23-63, column 9, lines 41-60

and column 10, lines 41-63).

4.   Regarding claim 27, Win teaches after said providing the virtual record to the

attribute information receiving apparatus:

providing, by the attribute information providing server, an attribute certificate to the

attribute information receiving apparatus in relation to a new transaction between the

subscriber and the attribute information receiving apparatus, wherein the attribute

certificate pertains to the M attributes in the virtual record provided to the attribute

information receiving apparatus (column 5, lines 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-9, column

17, lines 28-37, column 19, lines 56-63 and column 22, lines 41-46).

5.   Regarding claim 28, Win teaches wherein the attribute information providing

server comprises:

a customer record display unit for displaying the virtual record (Figures 10a-10c, column

17, lines 52-67 and column 18, lines 14-27);

an attribute selection unit for extracting the M attributes from the data record prior to

said generating the virtual record (Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15,

lines 35-52 and column 16, lines 13-58);

a virtual record generation unit for performing said generating the virtual record (Figures

10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column 16, lines 13-58);

a VID token issue unit for performing generating the virtual ID token prior to said

providing the virtual token ID to the user device (Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 2, lines

42-67, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64);

a virtual record referencing unit for referencing the virtual record based on the VID prior

to said providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving apparatus

(Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column 16, lines

13-58);

and a virtual record issue unit for performing said providing the virtual record to the

attribute information receiving apparatus (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 2, lines 42-67,

column 5, lines 1-12 and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the

instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via

a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication

coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network

link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other

data devices").

6.   Regarding claim 29, Win teaches wherein the VID token further comprises a

URL of the attribute information providing server (Figures 3a-3c, column 5, lines 13-21,

66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-9 and 58-65, column 7, lines 45-57, column 8, lines 5-63
and column 14, lines 34-43 and 56-67).

7.   Regarding claim 30, Win teaches wherein the attribute information providing
server is selected from the group consisting of a financial institution, an Internet
Service Provider (ISP), and a shopping site on the network (column 26, lines 44-67).

8.   Regarding claim 31, Win teaches receiving a selection of M1 attributes of the L
attributes in the data record, wherein the M1 attributes are not identical to the M
attributes (Figure 10b, column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of
each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 11, lines 42-
64, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column 26, lines 14-67,
"remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the
instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918
provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is
connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data
communication through one or more networks to other data devices");
and storing a second virtual record in the database, wherein the second virtual record
comprises the M1 attributes, and wherein the attribute information providing server
performs said receiving the selection of M1 attributes and said storing the second virtual
record in the database (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of
each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 11, lines 42-
64, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52).

9.   Regarding claim 32, Win teaches wherein the data record comprises a globally-unique ID (GID) serving as a primary key of the data record, wherein the VID is a primary key of the virtual record, and wherein the VID is independent of the GID (Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column 16, lines 13-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win as applied to claim 23, as cited above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,834,272 to Naor et al., hereinafter Naor.

10.   Win significantly discloses the claimed invention as cited within claim 23; however Win fails to disclose the limitation found within claim 26. Naor discloses this limitation, as cited below.

11.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Naor within the teachings of Win in order for "any number of parties, via a center, to collectively compute any function in a manner that preserves the privacy of the individual private inputs of the parties to the collective computation, even after the computation of the function has been completed" (*Naor* – column 4, lines 46-58).

12.   Regarding claim 26, Naor teaches wherein said providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving apparatus is performed using a 1-out-of-N OT (Oblivious Transfer) protocol (Figure 5, element "532" and Figure 7, element "712", column 11, lines 30-67, column 12, lines 1-3 and 34-44, column 13, lines 42-55, column 17, lines 35-66 and column 19, lines 52-64).

   (10) Response to Argument

Argument A: "Win does not teach the feature: 'receiving a request from a user device via a network from a virtual ID token relating to attribute information pertaining to a subscriber associated with the user device'".

Though Win does not sufficiently disclose "a virtual ID token", it is upheld that the cited sections of Win sufficiently disclose the composition of the Appellant's "virtual ID token". On page 3 of the Appellant's Appeal Brief, it is stated that the "virtual ID token comprises the VID. See specification, page 14, lines 10-11". However, the Appellant's Specification does not further define as to what the "virtual ID token" is, but rather its composition. Therefore, the claimed "virtual ID token" lacks a sufficient written description and support. Thus, the claimed composition, (i.e. "attribute information") is

analogous to Win's disclosure of, inter alia, "roles", "profile information", "user's name and password" and so forth, as previously-cited.

Further, a token is an encrypted identification of one valid user or group on an external authentication system. On page 13 of the Appellant's Specification, it is stated that "In the general acquirement, the attribute information receiving apparatus 50 connects to the attribute information providing server 10 by using the URL included in the VID token, presents the VID, and acquires the virtual record." Win discloses this within, but not limited to, column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 6, lines 58-65, column 8, lines 47-63, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52.

Additionally, the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not limited to Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 5, lines 1-12, column 17, lines 28-38, "secure token" and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data devices".

Argument B: "Win does not teach the feature: 'responsive to the request for the virtual ID token, reading a data record from a database, said data record comprising L attributes of the subscriber, L being at least 2'".

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not
limited to Figures 5a, element "508", 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26, "Registry
Server 108 returns the result of verifying the *user's name and password*" and 41-55,
"profile information may comprise the user's name, locale information, IP address, and
information defining roles held by the user", column 11 and lines 42-64.

Regarding the Appellant's assertion that the citations within Win do "not teach that the
user profile comprises at least 2 attributes, as required by claim 23", the Examiner
respectfully disagrees and interprets that the claimed "L attributes of the subscriber"
pertain to the "profile information" as disclosed by Win.

**Argument C: "Win does not teach the feature: 'providing the data record to the
user device via the network'".**

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not
limited to, column 5, lines 1-12, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-16 and 58-65, "Runtime
Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is
authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return
information that is customized based on the user's name and roles" and column 26,
lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and
send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918
provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is
connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data
communication through one or more networks to other data devices".

Argument D: "Win does not teach the feature: 'receiving, from the user device, via the network, a selection of M attributes of the L attributes, M being less than L'".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses this claimed feature, as cited above and further in view of column 3, lines 7-25, "the receiving step further comprises the steps of storing, in a database accessible by the Web application server, information describing one or more roles and one or more access rights of the user that are stored in association with user identifying information, wherein the roles represent the work responsibilities carried out by the user in the enterprise, and wherein the access rights represent the kinds and levels of access privileges that are held by the user in the enterprise". The "one or more roles and one or more access rights of the user" are received and are "in association with user identifying information". The "user identifying information" isn't sent along with said "roles" or "access rights", thus said "roles" and "access rights" would be the claimed "M attributes".

Further, within column 6, lines 41-54, a "name and password" are given to an "Authentication Client Module" for verification purposes. Those two pieces of information constitute "attributes" and since only those two pieces are given and not additional information (i.e. roles), the claimed "M attributes" are disclosed by said "name and password" as well.

Argument E: "Win does not teach the feature: 'generating a virtual record including the M attributes selected from the data record, said virtual record comprising a virtual ID (VID) for identifying the virtual record'".

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection and further states that Win additionally discloses the claimed invention within column 10, lines 41-55, "profile information may comprise the user's name, locale information, IP address, and information defining roles held by the user". Said "profile" being the Appellant's claimed "virtual record".

Argument F: "Win does not teach the feature: 'storing the generated virtual record in the database'".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses said "storing the generated virtual record in the database" as cited within column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, "central repository", column 12, lines 32-55, "Registry Repository 110 is the primary data store for the system 2. It contains data on Users, Resources, and Roles and configuration information required for the system 2 to function. Selected data, for example, passwords, are stored in Registry Repository 110 in encrypted form" and column 15, lines 35-52, "An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each individual user to be defined. In response, Registry Server 108 stores information defining the user in the Registry Repository 110." The claimed "database" is sufficiently disclosed by the, inter alia, "Registry Repository" of Win.

Argument G: "Win does not teach the feature: 'providing the virtual ID token to the user device via the network, wherein the virtual ID token comprises the VID'".

With regards to this argument, the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not limited to Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 5, lines 1-12,

column 17, lines 28-38, "secure token" and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer

can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a

telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data

communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922"

and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more

networks to other data devices".

Further, a token is an encrypted identification of one valid user or group on an external

authentication system. On page 13 of the Appellant's Specification, it is stated that "In

the general acquirement, the attribute information receiving apparatus 50 connects to

the attribute information providing server 10 by using the URL included in the VID token,

presents the VID, and acquires the virtual record." Win discloses this within, but not

limited to, column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each

resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 6, lines 58-65,

column 8, lines 47-63, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52. Additionally,

on page 3 of the Appellant's Appeal Brief, it is stated that the "virtual ID token comprises

the VID. See specification, page 14, lines 10-11". However, the Appellant's

Specification does not further define as to what the "virtual ID token" is, but rather its

composition; thus the cited sections of Win sufficiently disclose the composition of the

Appellant's "virtual ID token".

Argument H: "Win does not teach the feature: 'wherein an attribute information

providing server performs said receiving the request for the virtual ID token, said

reading the data record from the database, said providing the data record to the

user device, said receiving the selection of M attributes, said generating the

virtual record, said storing the generated virtual record in the database, and said

providing the virtual ID token to the user device'".

The Examiner maintains that Win teaches the claimed invention, as cited above, in

particular but not limited to column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association

of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 11, lines

42-64, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52.

Regarding the claim language of "reading the data record from the database", the

Examiner maintains that column 13, lines 39-52, column 14, lines 3-18 and 34-43,

column 15, lines 23-52 and column 16, lines 16-28 and Table 1 convey an Administrator

viewing profiles and assigning roles and proper access privileges. The Administrator is

"reading" each profile when the assigning occurs.

Argument I: "In addition with respect to claim 24, Win does not teach the feature:

'receiving a request comprising the VID for attribute information associated with

the VID from an attribute information receiving apparatus via the network'".

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not

limited to Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52. Further,

within column 21, lines 9-21, "the resource may assume that the request is

authenticated but may not be able to use system roles. It may have to lookup

authorization attributes from the legacy data store." Verification has occurred but it still

needs to be determined as to what access privileges are allowed. Thus an attempt to

obtain the claimed "attribute information associated with the VID" occurs. Hence, Win

discloses the claimed invention.

Argument J: "In addition with respect to claim 24, Win does not teach the feature:

'reading the virtual record from the database in response to the request

comprising the VID'".

Regarding the claim language of "reading the virtual record from the database", the

Examiner maintains that column 13, lines 39-52, column 14, lines 3-18 and 34-43,

column 15, lines 23-52 and column 16, lines 16-28 and Table 1 convey an Administrator

viewing profiles and assigning roles and proper access privileges. The Administrator is

"reading" each profile when the assigning occurs.

Argument K: "In addition with respect to claim 24, Win does not teach the feature:

'after said reading, providing the virtual record to the attribute information

receiving apparatus via the network'".

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not

limited to, column 5, lines 1-12, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-16 and 58-65, "Runtime

Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is

authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return

information that is customized based on the user's name and roles" and column 26,

lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and

send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918

provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is

connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data

communication through one or more networks to other data devices".

Argument L: "In addition with respect to claim 24, Win does not teach the feature:

'wherein the attribute information providing server performs said receiving the

request comprising the VID, said reading the virtual record from the database,

and said providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving

apparatus'".

The Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not

limited to, column 5, lines 1-12, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-16 and 58-65, "Runtime

Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is

authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return

information that is customized based on the user's name and roles" and column 26,

lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and

send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918

provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is

connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data

communication through one or more networks to other data devices".

Regarding the claim language of "reading the virtual record from the database", the

Examiner maintains that column 13, lines 39-52, column 14, lines 3-18 and 34-43,

column 15, lines 23-52 and column 16, lines 16-28 and Table 1 convey an Administrator

viewing profiles and assigning roles and proper access privileges. The Administrator is

"reading" each profile when the assigning occurs.

Argument M: "In addition, with respect to claim 25, Win does not teach the

feature: 'wherein said providing the virtual record to the attribute information

receiving apparatus is performed in manner that ensures that the virtual ID is

concealed from the attribute information receiving apparatus when the virtual

record is received by the attribute information receiving apparatus'".

The Examiner asserts that this claimed feature is disclosed by Win within, but not

limited to column 6, lines 41-54, column 8, lines 23-63, column 9, lines 41-60 and

column 10, lines 41-63. Within column 6, it is stated that "If the name and password are

correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user's roles from the Registry Server

109. *It then encrypts and sends this information* in a 'cookie' to the user's browser" and

that "The Runtime Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that

the user is authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource

to return information that is customized based on the user's name and roles".

Argument N: "In addition with respect to claim 27, Win does not teach the feature:

'after said providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving

apparatus: providing, by the attribute information providing server, an attribute

certificate to the attribute information receiving apparatus in relation to a new

transaction between the subscriber and the attribute information receiving

apparatus, wherein the attribute certificate pertains to the M attributes in the

virtual record provided to the attribute information receiving apparatus'".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses this claimed feature as cited within column 5,

lines 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-9, "Users may log in either with a digital certificate or

by opening a login page URL with a web browser and entering a name and password",

column 17, lines 28-37, column 19, lines 56-63, "Remote procedure calls to Registry

Server 108 are authenticated using digital certificates, encrypted, and encapsulated

within HTTP transactions" and column 22, lines 41-46, "Access Server 106 and Registry

Server 108 exchange digital certificates over encrypted link 109. The digital certificates

are used during the SSL handshake for mutual authentication. Remote procedure calls

from Access Server 106 to Registry Server 108 are then sent over an encrypted

HTTP/SSL session".

Argument O: "Appellant's maintain that claim 28 is likewise not anticipated by

Win under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)".

The Examiner asserts that the Appellant's claim limitations are sufficiently disclosed by

Win, as cited above. As disclosed within Figures 10a-10c, column 17, lines 52-67 and

column 18, lines 14-27 of Win, "Figure 10A is a simplified block diagram of an

exemplary screen display or HTML page 1002 that is generated by Administration

Application 114 for display browser 100 when a Resource Administration Function is

selected" and that the "Administration Application 114 will attempt to find and display

existing information about the resource from Registry Repository 110". This discloses

the Appellant's claimed "a customer record display unit for displaying the virtual record".

Further, the claimed "an attribute selection unit for extracting the M attributes from the

data record prior to said generating the virtual record" is disclosed by Win within, but not

limited to Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column

16, lines 13-58.

Additionally, within column 21, lines 9-27, "the resource may assume that the request is authenticated but may not be able to use system roles. It may have to lookup authorization attributes from the legacy data store." And "the CGI program may have to use REMOTE_USER to get the user's name and password in the legacy system from the Registry Server. It can then use this information to login and access the legacy resource." The "user's name and password" are the Appellant's "M attributes" and are used in conjunction with Win's "authorization attributes" to complete the authorization process to enable a user to obtain access. Thus, this procedure is utilized before the Appellant's claimed "virtual record" can be obtained.

Regarding the Appellant's claim language of "a virtual record generation unit for performing said generating the virtual record", the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection and further states that Win additionally discloses the claimed invention within column 10, lines 41-55, "profile information may comprise the user's name, locale information, IP address, and information defining roles held by the user". Said "profile" being the Appellant's claimed "virtual record".

Regarding the Appellant's "a virtual record referencing unit for referencing the virtual record based on the VID prior to said providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving apparatus", the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not limited to Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52. Further, within column 21, lines 9-21, "the resource may assume that the request is authenticated but may not be able to use system roles. It may have to lookup authorization attributes from the legacy data store." Verification has

occurred but it still needs to be determined as to what access privileges are allowed. Thus the "virtual record" is referenced to complete the transaction. Hence, Win discloses the claimed invention.

Regarding the Appellant's claim language of "providing the virtual record to the attribute information receiving apparatus", the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not limited to, column 5, lines 1-12, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-16 and 58-65, "Runtime Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return information that is customized based on the user's name and roles" and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data devices".

Argument P: "In addition, with respect to claim 29, Win does not teach the feature: 'wherein the VID token further comprises a URL of the attribute information providing server'".

The Examiner maintains that Win discloses this claimed feature, as disclosed within column 5, lines 13-21, 66 and 67, column 6, lines 1-9 and 58-65, column 7, lines 45-57, "administrator enters, for each Protected Server 104, an identifier; a name; a protocol; a port; a description; *the location of an authentication server*; URLs that identify pages displayed upon logout, upon login, and where restricted resources are encountered; the

Protected Server on which cookies are stored", column 8, lines 5-63, "Open the

Resource designated by this URL" and column 14, lines 34-43, "Each resource is

defined by a resource identifier value, a resource name, a description, a Web server, a

Relative URL, and a list of protected resources" and lines 56-67.

Argument Q: "Appellant's maintain that claim 30 is likewise not anticipated by

Win under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)".

Regarding the additional argument of "with respect to claim 30, Win does not teach the

feature: 'wherein the VID token further comprises a URL of the attribute information

providing server'", it is noted that the features upon which appellant relies are not recited

in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, the actual claim language of claim 30 is "wherein the attribute information

providing server is selected from the group consisting of a financial institution, an

Internet Service Provider (ISP), and a shopping site on the network". The Examiner

asserts that this claim language is disclosed by Win within column 26, lines 44-67,

"network link 920 may provide a connection through local network 922 to a host

computer 924 or to data equipment operated by an Internet Service Provider (ISP) 926".

It is interpreted by the Examiner that the selection of the "attribute information providing

server" pertains to only one of the choices being utilized; hence the citation of Win's

disclosure of "data equipment operated by an Internet Service Provider (ISP)". Thus

Win discloses the claimed invention.

Argument R: "In addition with respect to claim 31, Win does not teach the feature:

'receiving a selection of M1 attributes of the L attributes in the data record,

wherein the M1 attributes are not identical to the M attributes'".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses this claimed feature, as cited within Figure

10b, column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to

one or more of the roles", column 11, lines 42-64, "Personalized Menu Service

constructs a personalized menu of resources showing only those resources that the

user is authorized to access according to the user's profile information", column 12,

lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52, "administrator may complete and submit the data

entry form for each individual user to be defined".

Also, within column 3, lines 7-25, "the receiving step further comprises the steps of

storing, in a database accessible by the Web application server, information describing

one or more roles and one or more access rights of the user that are stored in

association with user identifying information, wherein the roles represent the work

responsibilities carried out by the user in the enterprise, and wherein the access rights

represent the kinds and levels of access privileges that are held by the user in the

enterprise". The "one or more roles and one or more access rights of the user" are

received and are "in association with user identifying information". The "user identifying

information" being an additional subset of the Appellant's claimed "attributes".

Argument S: "In addition with respect to claim 31, Win does not teach the feature:

'storing a second virtual record in the database, wherein the second virtual

record comprises the M1 attributes, and wherein the attribute information

providing server performs said receiving the selection of M1 attributes and said

storing the second virtual record in the database'".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses said "storing a second virtual record in the

database" as cited within column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association

of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, "central

repository", column 12, lines 32-55, "Registry Repository 110 is the primary data store

for the system 2. It contains data on Users, Resources, and Roles and configuration

information required for the system 2 to function. Selected data, for example,

passwords, are stored in Registry Repository 110 in encrypted form" and column 15,

lines 35-52, "An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each

individual user to be defined. In response, Registry Server 108 stores information

defining the user in the Registry Repository 110." The claimed "database" is sufficiently

disclosed by the, inter alia, "Registry Repository" of Win.

Argument T: "Appellant's maintain that claim 32 is likewise not anticipated by

Win under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)".

The Examiner asserts that Win discloses the claimed invention as cited within, but not

limited to column 12, lines 32-55, column 15, lines 35-52 and column 16, lines 13-58,

"Administrative Privilege value".

Argument U: "claim 26 is likewise not unpatentable over Win in view of Naor

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)".

With regards to the claim language of "wherein said providing the virtual record to the

attribute information receiving apparatus is performed using a 1-out-of-N OT (Oblivious

Transfer) protocol", the Examiner maintains the above-cited grounds of rejection, in

particular but not limited to column 11, lines 30-67, "Oblivious Transfer", "1-out-of-2

Oblivious Transfer", column 12, lines 1-3 and 34-44, "the notion of Oblivious Transfer

has been extended to a protocol herein denoted as 1-out-of-2 Proxy Oblivious

Transfer", column 13, lines 42-55, column 17, lines 35-66 and column 19, lines 52-64.

The elaboration of the functionality of the "1-out-of-N OT (Oblivious Transfer) protocol",

within the cited sections of Naor, provides sufficient grounds of rejection for this claim.

The Appellant further argues "that the Examiner's stated reason for modifying Win by

the alleged teaching of Naor is not persuasive, because the Examiner stated reason,

and the Examiner's citation to Naor, col. 4, 46-58, is unrelated to the 1-out-of-N OT

(Oblivious Transfer) protocol recited in the preceding feature of claim 26". However, the

Appellant does not elaborate as to how the claimed "1-out-of-N (Oblivious Transfer)

protocol" is different from the Oblivious Transfer protocols disclosed within Naor; thus it

is interpreted by the Examiner that the claimed "1-out-of-N (Oblivious Transfer) protocol"

is analogous to the protocols disclosed within Naor and cited as grounds of rejection for

claim 26.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeremiah Avery/

Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Conferees:

/Christopher A. Revak/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Kimyen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435